REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

Claims 1-11 are pending and under consideration.

Claims 1-9 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 6, and 7 have been amended.

Claims 10 and 11 have been added.

No claims have been withdrawn from consideration, cancelled, allowed, or objected to.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

In the Office Action, at page 2, claims 1, 6, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious in view of Nakayama. Claims 2, 7, and 9 were rejected as obvious over Nakayama in view of Miller. Claim 4 was rejected as obvious over Nakayama in view of Miller and Worley. Claim 5 was rejected as obvious over Nakayama in view of Worley. These rejections are traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 recites an information processing apparatus (e.g. a processor) connected to two operation-related apparatuses. One of the connected apparatuses is "an operating apparatus", for example a client computer. The other connected apparatus is "an apparatus to be operated", for example a printer. Claim 1 recites that the two apparatuses are connected to an information processing apparatus, which "stores instruction information for operating said apparatus to be operated". Furthermore, the information processing apparatus "reads said instruction information ... in response to a request from said operating apparatus and sends said instruction information to said operating apparatus". As a result, the operating apparatus does not need to store instruction information for the "apparatus to be operated", and the "apparatus to be operated" can be easily added and updated.

Claim 1 was rejected as obvious in view of Nakayama. The rejection compared the "apparatus to be operated" of claim 1 with the "hardware attached to [the] server" in Nakayama. However, claim 1 recites that the "apparatus to be operated" is operated by the "instruction

information". The rejection compared this to "entry information" in Nakayama. The "entry information" in Nakayama is used for accessing a function that the *server* can supply, and is therefore different from the "instruction information" that is used for operating the "apparatus to be operated".

Furthermore, the "callable function" in Nakayama is different from the "instruction information" of claim 1 because the "callable function" is information that indicates an address for calling a function that can be supplied *from the proxy server program* to the client program. The called function is not for an "apparatus to be operated" that is connected to the "information processing apparatus" (server).

In addition, claim 1 recites that the "instruction information" is sent to the "apparatus to be operated" in response to a request from the "operating apparatus". The rejection compared this to the request for callable functions 708 in Nakayama. However, Nakayama indicates that the "request [for the] set of callable functions" goes from the proxy server and to the real (non-proxy) server. Considering this difference and the differences mentioned above, step 708 of Nakayama is not the same as the "request" recited in claim 1. Furthermore, step 712 of Nakayama is a *step for using* callable functions, and therefore does not correspond to the "instruction information" of claim 1.

The distinctions above are applicable to claims 6 and 8. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 6, and 8 is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 6 AND 7 NOT NARROWED

Claims 6 and 7 have been amended only to remove “step” language, and have therefore not been narrowed in scope.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are deemed patentable due at least to their dependence from allowable independent claims. These claims are also patentable due to their recitation of independently distinguishing features. For example, with regard to claims 2, 7, and 9, Nakayama does not discuss anything related to an "instruction information obtaining part which

obtains said instruction information from said apparatus to be operated", because Nakayama does not disclose "instruction information" or an "apparatus to be operated". Withdrawal of the rejection of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 10 and 11 have been added. New claim 10 may be compared to claim 8, but without "means" language. New claim 11 clarifies an aspect of the present invention in which a peripheral device is connected to a server. Claim 10 is supported at least by original claim 8, and claim 11 is supported at least by pages 8 and 9 of the present specification.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9 JAN 2003

By: James Strom

James T. Strom
Registration No. 48,702

700 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231

on January 9, 2003

STAAS & HALSEY

By: Dawn Anderson

Date: January 9, 2003

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please AMEND the claims in accordance with the following:

1. (ONCE AMENDED) An information processing apparatus to which an operating apparatus and an apparatus to be operated by said operating apparatus are connected, said information processing apparatus comprising: an instruction information storing part which stores instruction information for operating said apparatus to be operated; and

an instruction information send part which reads said instruction information from said instruction information storing part in response to a request from said operating apparatus and sends said instruction information to said operating apparatus.

2. (UNAMENDED) The information processing apparatus as claimed in claim 1, further comprising an instruction information obtaining part which obtains said instruction information from said apparatus to be operated when said instruction information storing part does not include said instruction information corresponding to said request.

3. (UNAMENDED) The information processing apparatus as claimed in claim 1, further comprising a communication type accommodation part which accommodates difference between communication types of said operating apparatus and said apparatus to be operated.

4. (UNAMENDED) The information processing apparatus as claimed in claim 3, wherein said communication type accommodation part includes a converter which converts data such that a protocol of said data becomes suitable for said communication type.

5. (UNAMENDED) The information processing apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein said apparatus to be operated is a printer.

6. (ONCE AMENDED) An information processing method of an information processing apparatus to which an operating apparatus and an apparatus to be operated by said operating apparatus are connected, said information processing method comprising:

[an instruction information request receiving step of] receiving from said operating

apparatus a request for instruction information for operating said apparatus to be operated; and

[a sending step of] sending said instruction information from said information processing apparatus to said operating apparatus in response to said request.

7. (ONCE AMENDED) The information processing method as claimed in claim 6, wherein said sending [step comprising a step of] comprises obtaining said instruction information from said apparatus to be operated when said information processing apparatus does not include said instruction information corresponding to said request.

8. (UNAMENDED) A computer readable medium storing program code for causing a computer system to process information, an operating apparatus and an apparatus to be operated by said operating apparatus being connected to said computer system, said computer readable medium comprising:

first program code means for receiving from said operating apparatus a request for instruction information for operating said apparatus to be operated; and

second program code means for sending said instruction information to said operating apparatus in response to said request.

9. (UNAMENDED) The computer readable medium as claimed in claim 8, wherein said second program code means comprising program code means for obtaining said instruction information from said apparatus to be operated when said computer system does not include said instruction information corresponding to said request.

10. (NEW) A computer readable medium storing program code for causing a computer system to process information, an operating apparatus and an apparatus to be operated by said operating apparatus being connected to said computer system, said computer readable medium comprising:

first program code receiving from said operating apparatus a request for instruction information for operating said apparatus to be operated; and

second program code sending said instruction information to said operating apparatus in response to said request.

11. (NEW) A method, comprising:

managing and storing, at a server connected to a client, a list of software commands for operating, using the server, a peripheral device connected to a client;

at the client, responding to receiving a user command for operating the peripheral device by requesting from the server the software command list and then generating an operating command on the basis of the command list received from the server; and

sending the generated operating command from the client to the server, which controls the peripheral device in accordance with the operating command.